

## **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Final Office Action mailed on July 26, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 10, and 19 are amended, claim 6 is canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-5, and 7-20 are now pending in this application.

### **§103 Rejection of the Claims**

#### **Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15, and 17-19**

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,100,996), in view of Hirst (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,174) and Nakano (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,097). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

With regard to claim 6, which depends from independent claim 1, the Examiner cites the Amano reference as describing “that the printer components are configured to use a default value if the humidity value is not available.” (See col. 13, lines 36-40) The cited sentence states, “When the toner cartridge is replaced by another one and the print unit 17 returns to the normal status, the dither matrix is changed to the normal one (to be used in the normal printing state) . . .” By so stating, the Amano reference appears to describe print components that “return[] to the normal status” only “[w]hen the toner cartridge is replaced by another one”. This appears to show that the print cartridge has been removed; as a result, the print operation is no longer operational.

In contrast, Applicant’s independent claim 1, as amended, which includes the limitations of claim 6, recites, “wherein the printer components are configured to use a default value if the humidity value is not available during the print operation.” The immediately preceding element of claim 1 recites, “configured to electronically control a printing operation based on the humidity value”. Support for the limitation “during the print operation” appears on page 8, lines 16-20, of the present application, which recites:

If the printer system does not receive an initial humidity value from the toner cartridge, then a default humidity value that was pre-configured into the printer system is used to configure the dither matrix. Thus, the printer system 100 remains operational if the toner cartridge cannot provide humidity values.

Thus, whereas the Amano reference appears to teach that the print unit returns to the normal status when the toner cartridge is replaced by another one, thereby interrupting the print operation, independent claim 1 of the present application, as amended, specifies that “the printer components are configured to use a default value if the humidity value is not available during the print operation.”

Similarly, independent claim 19, as amended, recites as an element, “printer components that are configured to use a default value if the humidity value is not available during the print operation.” The immediately preceding element of claim 19 recites, “configured to transfer the humidity value from the humidity sensor to the printer system to electronically control a printing operation.”

Regarding independent claim 10, the Examiner states that “the structural elements of claim 1 perform all the steps of method claim 10”, and that, “[t]herefore, claim 10 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 1.” Applicant’s independent claim 10, as amended, recites as an element, “reconfiguring printer components if the humidity value has changed after a set time period, a set number of copies, and a set number of power cycles.” Introduction of this element is supported on page 9, lines 1-3, of the present application, which recites, “The dither matrix could also be re-configured after a set time period or after a set number of copies or power cycles – and then only if the humidity value has changed appreciably to warrant re-configuration.”

The cited element of independent claim 10, as amended, is not present in independent claim 1, and is not present in any other claims of the present application. Moreover, following review of the cited references, Applicant believes that these references do not describe, teach, or suggest the limitations of the element appended to claim 10.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element and limitation of independent claims 1, 10, and 19 is not described, taught or suggested in the Amano, Hirst, or Nakano references, either individually or in combination, and that claims 1, 10, and 19 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of claims 1, 10, and 19, as well as those claims that depend therefrom. Claim 6 has been canceled.

**Claims 5, 7, 14, 16 and 20**

Claims 5, 7, 14, 16 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,100,996), in view of Hirst (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,174) and Nakano (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,097) and further in view of Allen et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,268,094). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

For the reasons provided above regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 10, and 19, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19, from which claims 5, 7, 14, 16 and 20 depend, are in condition for allowance. From Applicant's review of the Allen reference, it does not cure the deficiencies of the Amano, Hirst, and Nakano references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of dependent claims 5, 7, 14, 16 and 20.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Gregg W. Wisdom at (360) 212-8052.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AF Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 21<sup>st</sup> day of September, 2005.

Alison L. Subendran  
Name

[Signature]  
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,  
George H. Kerby,

By his Representatives,

BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500  
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: [Signature]  
Edward J. Brooks III  
Reg. No. 40,925

Date: 9/21/2005